



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,901	02/20/2004	Jason T. Griffin	55525501.2551	7196
7590 04/24/2008				
David B. Cochran, Esq. Jones Day 901 Lakeside Avenue/North Point Cleveland, OH 44114			EXAMINER PILLAI, NAMITHA	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,901

Applicant(s)

GRIFFIN, JASON T.

Examiner

NAMITHA PILLAI

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/14/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's submission on 2/4/08. In view of the arguments directed to the QWERTY keyboard, the arguments are persuasive. Therefore, in view of the pre-brief appeal conference decision, prosecution has been re-opened. All pending claims have been rejected for being obvious over the prior arts disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (EP 1296216A 1) and U. S. Patent No. 7,216,588 B2 (Suess).

Claims 1 and 18: Williams discloses a predictive text system and device for use with a mobile device having a reduced-key keyboard (Page 5 :Table 1), a display (abstract), and an alert mechanism, comprising: an ambiguous word list (abstract) comprising a plurality of keystroke combinations, each keystroke combination representing a plurality of key selections on the reduced-key keyboard (Page 5 :Table 1), wherein the keystroke combinations present in the ambiguous word list are associated with more than one common predicted word (Page 2, [0003], Lines 20-24);

and a predictive text system module for receiving an input keystroke combination from the reduced-key keyboard (Page 5:Table 1) and for determining a predicted word for the input keystroke combination, wherein the predicted word is displayed on the display of the mobile device (Page 2, [0003], Lines 20-24); wherein the predictive text system module engages the alert mechanism on the mobile device if the input keystroke combination is present in the ambiguous word list (Page 3, [0022], Lines 56-58). Williams discloses a mobile device with a reduced-key keyboard but does not disclose that a reduce-key QWERTY keyboard. Suess discloses a reduced-key QWERTY keyboard used on a mobile communications device (Figure 13). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Suess a reduced-key QWERTY keyboard used on a mobile communications device. Suess discloses that generating a reduced key QWERTY keyboard on a mobile device allows for quick inputting while maintaining a keyboard layout that is more familiar to users who have already used the well known standard QWERTY keyboard (column 2, lines 18). Therefore one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from Suess a reduced-key QWERTY keyboard used on a mobile communications device.

Claims 2 and 19: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18, further comprising: a dictionary database (large intelligent dictionary: Page 4, [0030], Line 50); wherein the predictive text system determines the predicted word by matching the input keystroke combination with one or more predicted words stored in the dictionary database (Page 2, [0002], Lines 1 O- 11).

Claims 3 and 20: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 2 and 19, further comprising: a grammar rules database (Linguistic database, Page 2, [0002], Line 11); wherein if the predictive text system determines that there is more than one predicted word associated with the keystroke combination (Page 4, [0030], Lines 50-53), it determines the predicted word by applying a set of grammar rules from the grammar rules database to the input keystroke combination (Page 2, [0002], Lines 9-10).

Claims 4 and 21: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 further comprising: an alerts store for storing data that causes the mobile device to engage the alert mechanism ("Word Saved", Page 7, [0065], Lines 47-48).

Claims 5 and 22: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 wherein the alert mechanism is a change in the color ("reversed in colors in order to indicate") of the predicted word on the display (Page 3, [0022], Lines 56-58).

Claims 6 and 23: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 wherein the alert mechanism is an audible tone (alert beep, Page 7, [0055], Lines 14-15).

Claims 8 and 25: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 wherein the predicted words for each keystroke combination are organized in the ambiguous word list (several words) by frequency of occurrence in the language of the predicted words (Page 4, [0030], Lines 50-53).

Claim 9: Williams discloses the predictive text system of claim 8, wherein the language is English (Page 4, [0025], Line 17).

Claims 10 and 26: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 further comprising: a dictionary database containing one or more predicted words associated with a plurality of keystroke combinations (large intelligent dictionary, Page 4, [0030], Line 50); and a grammar rules database containing a plurality of grammatical constructs that describe proper grammar in a particular language (Linguistic database, Page 2, [0002], Line 11); and wherein the predictive text system module accesses the grammar rules database to determine the most probable part of speech of the input keystroke combination (Page 6, [0047], Lines 37-38), and then uses this determination to select one of the predicted words from the dictionary database (Page 6, [0047], Lines 37-40).

Claims 11 and 27: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 10 and 26 wherein the dictionary database provides a word tag for each predicted word, the word tag indicating the part of speech of the predicted word (Page 2, [0002], Lines 10-13).

Claims 12 and 28: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 11 and 27 wherein the predictive text system module compares the determination of the most probable part of speech to the word tags in the ambiguous word list (words matching a received string or ambiguous key strokes: abstract) in order to select one of

the predicted words from the dictionary database (large intelligent dictionary: Page 4, [0030], Line 50).

Claims 13 and 29: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 further comprising: a selection list comprising a plurality of alternative predicted words for each of a plurality of keystroke combinations (Page 4, [0023], Lines 1-2); and a data selection device for selecting information displayed on the mobile device (Page 4, [0023], Lines 3-5); wherein in response (step 102) to a user activating the data selection device, the predictive text system module retrieves (step 102) the alternative predicted words associated with the input keystroke combination and displays the alternative predicted words on the display (step 111) (Fig. 11).

Claims 14 and 30: Williams discloses the predictive text system and device of claim 13 and 29 wherein the data selection device is utilized by the user to select one of the alternative predicted words set forth on the display (Fig. 5; Page 6, lines 46-47).

Claim 15: Williams discloses the predictive text system of claim 1, wherein the ambiguous word list is modifiable by a user of the mobile device (mobile phone) (Page 2, Lines 20-23).

Claim 16: Williams discloses the predictive text system of claim 13, wherein the selection list is modifiable by a user of the mobile device (Page 4, [0023], Lines 2-4).

3. Claims 7 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams and Suess and in view of Schroeder et al. (US5797098).

Claims 7 and 24: Williams and Suess disclose the predictive text system and

device of claim 1 and 18, but do not explicitly disclose "the alert mechanism is a vibration device". Schroeder discloses vibratory (Column 8, Lines 40-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the alert mechanism "vibration" in Williams. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently alert users of the device by using vibration.

4. Claims 17 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams and Suess.

Claims 17 and 31: Williams and Suess disclose the predictive text system and device of claim 1 and 18 further comprising: a grammar rules database (Williams, Linguistic database, Page2, [0002], Line 11), but does not explicitly disclose "the predictive text system applies one or more grammatical rules from the grammar rules database to the input keystroke combination and disables the alert mechanism on the mobile device." Williams does disclose Linguistic database (Page2, [0002], Line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include grammatical rules and disable the alert mechanism in Williams. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently include grammatical rules to predict accurate words in a sentence.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, with respect to Williams not disclosing a reduced key QWERTY keyboard have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the

rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of *Suess*.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to Williams not disclosing an ambiguous word list and an alert have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Williams does not disclose an ambiguous word list. In contrast to Applicant's arguments, Williams discloses a list of matching words that represent the ambiguous word list. The list of matching words is generated in response to a sequence of keystrokes. This input of keystrokes is provided to the predictive editor program which generates a list of matching words that are associated with the sequence of keystrokes. Therefore this list represents a list of predicted words that are associated with the keystrokes.

Applicant argues that Williams does not disclose an alert, engaged if a keystroke combination is present in the ambiguous word list. In contrast to Applicant's arguments, Williams provides an alert mechanism. Williams discloses an alert means through which one word is marked which alerts the user to the word. This alerted word represents the keystroke combination that is matched and presented in the ambiguous word list.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited

therein teach the method for using a reduced key QWERTY keyboard in a mobile communication device.

Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

In responding to this office action, please note that the examiner of record for the above-identified application has changed. Please direct all future correspondence to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4054. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doon Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 2173

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Namitha Pillai
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
April 17, 2008

/Tadesse Hailu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173